DEC 0 1 2003

RECEIVED

FEDERAL ELECTION

COMMISSION

1	BEFORE THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION SECRETARIAT					
2	: 2003 DEC - 1 :	A II: 28				
4	In the Matter of)					
5 6 7 8	as Treasurer)	SENSITIV				
9 10 11	Brabender Cox Mihalke Political, Inc.)					
12	GENERAL COUNSEL'S REPORT # 3					
13	I. <u>ACTION RECOMMENDED</u> : Accept the attached proposed conciliation agreement					
14	with Brabender Cox Mihalke Political, Inc. ("Brabender"), take no further action as to Santorum					
15	2000 and Judith M. McVerry, as treasurer ("the Committee"), and close the file.					
16	II. <u>BACKGROUND</u>					
17	On January 7, 2003, the Commission found reason to believe that Brabender, a po	litical				
18	consulting firm incorporated in Pennsylvania, and the Committee, the principal campaign					
19	committee supporting the re-election of Richard J. Santorum to the U.S. Senate in 2002, violated					
20	2 U.S.C. § 441b(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act"). The					
21	basis for these findings was an unreimbursed expenditure of \$197,000 for media airtime made by					
22	Brabender on behalf of the Committee, which the Committee initially reported as a debt but later					
23	settled without payment. See First General Counsel's Report dated December 3, 2002. The					
24	Commission also found reason to believe that the Committee violated 2 U.S.C. § 434(b)(8) and					

¹ The facts relevant to this matter occurred prior to the effective date of the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002 ("BCRA"), Pub. L. 107-155, 116 Stat. 81 (2002). Unless specifically stated to the contrary, all citations to FECA, codified at 2 U.S.C. §§ 431 *et seq.*, the Commission's regulations and all statements of applicable law herein, refer to FECA and its implementing regulations as they existed prior to the effective date of BCRA.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

- 1 11 C.F.R. §§ 104.11(a) and 116.10(a) by failing to accurately report the \$197,000 as a disputed 2 debt, including an adequate explanation of the circumstances surrounding its settlement.
- B III. CONCILIATION AGREEMENT

ıΩ	IV	NO FIIDTHED	ACTION	AS TO THE	COMMITTEE

- In General Counsel's Report #2, this Office stated that it anticipated recommending that
- 20 the Commission take no further action as to the Committee

21_. 22

Since that time, this Office has obtained

- 1 no additional information relevant to the Committee. Consequently, for the reasons discussed
- 2 below, this Office recommends that the Commission take no further action as to the Committee
- 3 and close the file.

A. Prohibited Corporate Contribution

The Act prohibits any candidate or political committee from knowingly accepting or receiving any contribution or expenditure from a corporation. *See id.* "Knowingly" does not require a showing that the candidate or committee accepted the contribution with knowledge of a violation of law; instead, it merely requires a party's knowledge of the facts rendering its conduct unlawful. *See FEC v. Dramesi*, 640 F. Supp. 985, 987 (D.N.J. 1986); *accord FEC v. Friends of Jane Harman*, 59 F. Supp.2d 1046, 1056 n.11 (C.D.Cal. 1999).

Based upon the information submitted by the respondents, it does not appear that the Committee "knowingly" received the \$197,000 in-kind contribution. While it is true that the television ads were created in coordination with the Committee and while the Committee initially agreed to a budget and plan for the broadcasting of these ads, it would appear that the instructions to cancel the \$197,000 media purchase near the end of the campaign negated the Committee's "knowledge" and prior coordination of the media purchase.

B. Reporting Violations

A political committee is required to continuously report all debts and obligations owed until extinguished. See 2 U.S.C. § 434(b)(8); 11 C.F.R. §§ 104.3(d), 104.11(a). Where such debts and obligations are settled for less than their reported amount or value, each report must contain a statement as to the circumstances and conditions under which the debt was incurred or extinguished and the amount paid. See id.

In its 2000 Year-End Report, the Committee disclosed the \$197,000 as a debt owed to Brabender for "media buy." The Committee explained in its response to the Commission's reason to believe findings that its treasurer, Judith McVerry, was not aware that the \$197,000 represented unauthorized media buys at the time she submitted the Report. See Attachment 10, at 2. According to the Committee, it was not until February 2001 when the Committee had an opportunity to review the details of its overall campaign spending and debt retirement plan that it realized that Brabender invoiced the Committee for unauthorized media buys. See id. Thus, it does not appear that the Committee misrepresented the nature of the \$197,000 invoice in its 2000 Year-End Report.

Once it discovered the unauthorized expenditure, the Committee should have amended its 2000 Year-End Report and removed the \$197,000 "debt" from Schedule D with a letter of explanation. Instead, the Committee reported in its 2001 Mid-Year Report that the "debt" had been paid with a cover letter indicating that the \$197,000 was an unauthorized expenditure that the vendor agreed the Committee was not responsible for. This error reportedly occurred on the advice of the Commission's Reports Analysis Division ("RAD").²

Given that the reporting error was relatively minor, the fact that the Committee provided a letter of explanation with its 2001 Mid-Year Report, and the entire context of this matter, this Office believes that the Commission should take no further action as to this violation.

According to the Committee, the Committee reported that the debt had been paid on the advice of its RAD Analyst. See Attachment 9, at 2. Records maintained by RAD indicate that a RAD Analyst had a telephone conversation with counsel for the Committee on June 28, 2001 and that during this conversation counsel advised that it had a debt owed to a consultant that had been disputed, that the amount in dispute had been reduced and that counsel would provide a letter of explanation. These records provide no indication that the Analyst, who is no longer employed with the FEC, offered advice to the Committee regarding the reporting of the debt or its settlement.

